

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 38.—No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 10, 1821. [Price 6d.

TO THE FARMERS' WIVES.

On the cause of their present penury. On the prudence of not keeping Bank-Notes when they can get gold, or silver instead of them.

~~~~~  
“ And there was a man, who had  
“ three thousand sheep and a thousand  
“ goats: and he was shearing his sheep  
“ in Carmel. Now, the name of the  
“ man was *Nabal*; and the name of  
“ his wife, *Abigail*; and she was a  
“ woman of good understanding;  
“ but *Nabal* was *churlish*, and evil in  
“ his doings.”—I. SAM. CH. 25.

~~~~~  
London, 5th March, 1821.

LADIES,

You are all well acquainted with the character, the conduct and the fate of the rich farmer, *Nabal* of old, of whom, I am sorry to say it, too many of your husbands have long been the too close imitators. Numerous are the occasions, on which I have appealed to them; but I have appealed in vain. Therefore, like the messengers of David, I

turn about and appeal to you, as they did to the sensible, amiable and pious *Abigail*, who, as you, doubtless, remember, soon caused things to be settled in the most comfortable manner, and whose laudable example some, at least, of you, if under similar circumstances, would, I will venture to say, be heartily disposed to follow.

Your husbands complain of *deep distress*, and they are extremely clamorous for *relief*. In a *New Year's Gift* to them, I have explained to them the causes of their distress; but, it would seem, that the explanation has done them little good; for their clamour is as senseless as at any former time. Let me, therefore, beseech *you* to listen to me; for, perhaps, you may be able to prevail upon these modern *Nabals* to quit their folly, and to act like men worthy of wives like you.

Their complaint is, that they wax poor; that they lose their substance daily; that they see utter ruin staring them in the face; that, so far from having a hope of being able to provide de-

2 D

cantly for their children, they have little hope of escaping the poor-house themselves. They pray the Parliament to *relieve* them; but, they never point out any thing that they want the Parliament to do. There is but *one* thing, that the Parliament *can* do to relieve them; and of this the Nabals appear to have the greatest *horror*: so that, unless you, their sensible wives, can enlighten their understandings, their case appears to be absolutely desperate.

It must be confessed, that there are many projects on foot for their relief, and for the relief of their miserable labourers, whom they are now compelled to keep in a state of half-starvation.—These projects are as various in their nature as the different patches of a beggar's coat are in colour. A large volume would not suffice for a description of a tenth part of them. Of one only will I attempt a description, which, however, must be sadly inadequate: it is that of a fine-spoken gentleman from the North. A Scotch gentleman; a Mr. BROUGHAM, who is an Edinburgh Reviewer, or, Philosopher, which means *Conjuror*. This gentleman, hearing the farmers complain of the weight of the poor-

rates; seeing the labouring classes almost raving with hunger, has proposed to give them *book-education*, and that, too, in part, at the expence of the labouring people themselves! He cannot have it in view to increase their disposition to labour; for, they have already "*made work scarce*."—His principle is, it would appear, that of economy in consumption. Having, in common with other philosophers, who now and then condescend to eat *pudding*, perceived, that, when the belly is full, the mind is contracted, he has concluded, that an expansion of the mind will produce a contraction of the bowels; whence will arise, he supposes, a diminution in the demand for food, and, hence, a reduction of the poor-rates.

Whether this project be likely to succeed, I leave to your superior judgment and greater experience; but, at any rate, this is, up to this day, the only project for the relief of the farmers that has not been abandoned, or, at least, so thoroughly scouted as to render all hope of success, in any other, ridiculous and contemptible to the last degree.

Before we talk of *relief*, we ought to ascertain the *cause* of

the evil complained of; as Doctors, when they are called in, ask, and very properly, "What have you been *eating*? How do you *live*? What do you *drink*? Do you sit up late? "Do you take exercise?" and so on. The symptoms of the farmers' present disease you can describe better than any body. That revenue, which, by something a great deal better than parchments, is yours; that income from the eggs, poultry, and, sometimes, the butter, which has been yours since England was England, is no longer safe. Nabal is now so pressed, that, though, certainly, with many *hums* and *ahs* and silly looks, he now cribs even from you. He calls it *borrowing*, perhaps. He gilds the pill as well as he can; but under one guise or another, he now lays his barbarous hands on this sacred fund. This is a symptom that can leave no doubt as to his state. Selling the gay cavalry-horse; laying down the gig; dismissing the port-bottle; exchanging the shining boots for spatterdashes: these all denote disorder in the purse; but, the invasion of the egg-money is proof of approaching dissolution.

What, then, is the *cause*?

What has poor Nabal eaten, as the Doctor would say? Let us come to plain language: *what makes him poor*? Is it that corn is *low-priced*? No: for farmers were rich and labourers well fed and the poor-rates were next to nothing, when wheat was sold for three shillings, or half a crown, a bushel. It is not that corn is *low-priced*, but that *money is high-priced*! This puzzles you. This poses Nabal. This is a mystery as great as roguish monk ever dealt in. Let me endeavour to explain the matter to you.

You know what *Paper-Money* means. It is called *bank-notes*. In the year 1811, the House of Commons declared, that a one pound note and a shilling were *equal in value* to a good golden guinea, though, at that time, it required *twenty nine shillings* in paper-money to *buy a guinea*! In 1819, the House of Commons declared, that a pound note and a shilling were *not equal* in value to a golden guinea, though it then required only a pound note and about three shillings to buy a golden guinea! This, and some other things, led some men to believe, that the House of Commons was not filled with the

sort of persons that it ought to be filled with, seeing that this House had the *guardianship of the public purse*. These men, therefore, said, pretty openly, that they wished for a change in the House; and, in order to induce other men to join them, they set forth their reasons, and cited, amongst other things, these strange and contradictory declarations. But, what did the House do? Why, it enacted, that no one should do any thing *tending* to bring it into *contempt*, on pain of *banishment*! And, what did the *Nabals* do? Why, they girded on their swords; they betook them every man to his horse and his helmet; and they swore that they would chop down all *seditioners* and *rebels*; for, thus they becalled the men, who did not implicitly believe, that a pound note and a shilling *were* and *were not*, equal in value to a golden guinea.

But, how was the *price of money raised*? Why, thus: the *House*, the House of Commons, passed a law in July 1819, the effect of which law was to cause there to be *less* money in the country; and, you know well, that, when eggs grow *scarce*, they grow dear. This act compelled

the Bankers to make less paper-money. This thing, therefore, became scarce, and, of course, it became dear. *How* this was carried on, how it *worked*, I have explained to the Nabals, and I beg leave to refer you to my letter to them, as far as relates to this part of the subject. I want *you* to know, and to bear in mind, that, the *real cause* of your poverty is to be found in *measures of the House of Commons*. This is what I wish you to bear in mind. This is what I wish you never to forget; because the Nabals have shown themselves to be the bitter, implacable and mortal foes of all of us, who have endeavoured to bring about a *change in that House*.

Now, therefore, sensible dames; women of good understanding; Abigails of England; pray lend your attention to one of your most ardent admirers, while he endeavours to prove that what he has here said is true.

If either of you, upon leaving your home for a while, were to leave your house in good order; your cows in good milk; your poultry in high feather; and every thing looking gaily and happily. If, during your absence, a housekeeper were to supply your place in the manage-

ment of your affairs, and she were invested with all your powers, and had at her full disposal all your usual revenues. If, at the end of a year or two, you were to return, find the cows dry, if not dead; the poultry nearly, or quite, extinguished; your garden over-run with weeds; and your house a scene of desolation and misery. If you were to find things thus, what would you do, as soon as you had overcome your first emotions of astonishment? Would you not call the *House-keeper to account*? Would you not enquire what she had been *doing*? Would you not ask what she had done with the butter and poultry money? And especially, if she had to present to you a bundle of unpaid bills from the grocer, the tinman and the crockery-ware man? Would you not inquire *what* had dried up the cows; *what* had destroyed the poultry? If she pretended *not to know*, what would you think of her? If she said, that it was no *fault of hers*, would you not be in a rage? If, upon your complaining, she were to threaten to pull your cap; and, if, before it was over, she were actually to scratch your eyes half out, what would you think then? Would you not think, that you were got into a strange state of

things? But, if, in addition to all this, you were to perceive, that she had taken care to *feather her own nest* and that of her relations, her brothers, sisters, and cousins, what would you *then* think of the matter?

Now, the House of Commons's power over the purse and all the affairs of this nation has not been less complete; it has not been less absolute, than the power of such supposed Housekeeper. It has had the power of doing with the people's property just what it pleased to do. It has made war and made peace; it has borrowed money; it has lent money to foreign Princes and Emperors. It has hired foreign troops. It has brought such troops into England. It has raised armies, militias of various sorts, yeomanry cavalry and volunteers. It has passed Corn-bills. It has voted money to ship off Englishmen to find the means of living in foreign lands, while it has voted other money for *the support of foreign emigrants here*. It has voted immense sums in the way of *charity to the Clergy*. It has voted other immense sums for *Secret Services*. It has protected numerous Parsons against the penalties of the law, even *after* the penalties had been incurred. It has many times suspended the

laws, made to protect our persons against arbitrary arrests and imprisonment.

There are men to say, that it was *right* for the House to have all these powers, and, indeed, it has exercised many others, of which I shall mention only that of *protecting the Bank against the lawful demands of its creditors*. Very well: let this *right* be undisputed: let it be allowed to be *right* that the House should have the same power over us and ours as the Potter has over the Clay; but, then, surely, if the pan be moulded in such a way as to produce mischief, and, indeed, if the pan be good for nothing, the whole of the *fault* must belong to the Potter. Mr. Potter, when the pipkin leaks, is not to tell us, that *he* is not answerable for it; that *he* cannot help it; that the *crack* arises from causes, over which *he* has had no controul. This would be a pretty way, indeed, of going on. We should, I believe, be very apt to be rather "*coarse*" in our language to Mr. Potter.

The House of Commons has had our affairs in its hands. It has done with us and ours what it pleased. This, the Nabals say, is *right*. Right let it be, then. But, if we find our affairs ruined;

if we find ourselves in misery; is it not *right* also, that we should be able to *complain* of the House, without danger to our lives? Is it, in short, wicked in us, to suggest the necessity of making a *change* in the House; that is to say, in those who have had the management of our affairs? Shall it be deemed criminal in us, if we endeavour to cause such change to be effected? What would you say, if, after seeing the result of your House-keeper's mismanagement, you were told, *that you must still keep her*; aye, and still leave your house and affairs to her absolute controul?

Pray, my dear Abigails, look a little steadily at this matter. About the time that some of you were born, this England was the happiest nation in the world. It was famed all over the world for the state of superior blessedness which its people enjoyed. "*The Roast Beef of Old England*" was a sort of proverb, or maxim, which meant, that English people lived better than any other people. There were, in fact, no people in England, who could, with strict propriety, be called *poor*. Now we are a mass of paupers with a few rich people. Now, the food of the far greater part of the people is by no means so good as

that which the American Farmer gives to his hogs, and which consists of *milk and very fine meal*; or of the *whole Corn*, which is also, in various shapes, food for man, woman, and child. Our labourers eat oatmeal and water; potatoes; or, at best, *bread*, without milk, butter, or meat. This change is notorious. Scrofula, leprosy, and various other disorders, are the consequence. A feeble, dwindled and deformed race of men must proceed, and *has* proceeded, from this cause; and, in this, at any rate, you ought to feel an interest. The Americans, taking them as they come, without picking, are, on an average, three inches *taller*, and more than one third *heavier*, than are the present race in the country of their forefathers. It is to *this*, more than to any thing else, that they owe their triumphs over us in arms; and *this* they owe to their *abundant living*.

Now, these facts being beyond dispute, we are not called upon to shew exactly *how* the people of England have been thus reduced from plenty to half-starvation. We may be unable to trace the effect back through the maze till we arrive at the cause; but, whether we be able, or not, we are not bound to do it; any more

than you would be to ascertain *how* your affairs had gone to ruin in the hands of your House-keeper, above supposed. If, upon finding your cows dry and with bones staring through their skin, you were told by your House-keeper, to hold your tongue, and not complain, not say a word *to her*, till you could ascertain precisely *how* the poor cattle had been brought into this state; till you could bring *proof*, bible-oath proof, that it was *she*, who had taken the milk out of the udders and the flesh off their bones with her own claws; if you were told this, I am afraid patience enough would not remain in you to keep you from laying hands on the tongs and splitting the haridan's skull? When a steward is found deficient does the Lord amuse himself with listening to the *how* of the deficit? Does he suffer himself to be quieted by stories about *accidents*? Does he suffer himself to be shuffled off with tales about *misfortunes*, and that, too, upon an *average of years*? Does any human being ever admit of *authority* without *responsibility*?

Observe, moreover, that, as to the affairs of a *nation*, there can, earthquakes only excepted, be nothing *happen*, that is to say, come from the elements, which

is not, in the end, productive of as much good as of evil. The rains, which injure the vallies, benefit the hills. A bad harvest for wheat is a fine season for grass and turnips. A scorching summer, or a hard winter, greatly fructify the earth. The winds that drive some ships on shore hasten others on their voyage. To talk about *mishaps* and *accidents*, in the affairs of nations, is a great deal worse than *childish*. Even in the private affairs of men this is a sort of language which ought to be very sparingly tolerated. I know an old farmer that never suffers the word *misfortune* to be uttered in his family. He always uses the word *misconduct*, even as applicable to the failure of his turnip crops; and, indeed, a scrupulous inquiry will shew us that he is correct. In a man's private affairs he may be thwarted, or oppressed by *irresistible power*; but, even this is not *misfortune*: it is *misconduct* somewhere. Misfortune never ought, at any rate, to be *presumed*. The presumption ought to be, *fault* somewhere, even in private affairs that have gone wrong. But, in the affairs of a *nation*, there *must be fault* of management, if those affairs go wrong; because the managers have nobody to oppress, thwart,

or controul them. And, in order to be entitled to pronounce those managers to be bad, we have only to ascertain, that the affairs of the nation have suffered while in their hands.

Governments call themselves *omnipotent*, sometimes, and this quality has been distinctly imputed to our Parliament. Indeed, there must be power absolute lodged somewhere in every nation. But, is not this with the condition, that there shall also be *absolute wisdom*? That there shall be clear *foresight*, as well as *perfect knowledge* of the present? Did it ever enter into the mind of a people to lodge *absolute power* to co-operate with presumed *imperfection* in *knowledge* or *capacity*? Would you invest a House-keeper with your powers without presuming that she *knew how* to manage your affairs? Is it not always understood, that he who *undertakes* to do a thing, and who *offers himself* for the purpose, does, upon being admitted, also undertake for his *ability to do it*? Aye, and it is very well known, that the law will give us redress against *pretenders* in any calling, or profession, if we, to our injury, have employed such pretenders.

And, with all these truths

before us, shall we not, when we find ourselves steeped in poverty and misery ; when we find this our country, once so happy, once famed throughout the world for its superior blessedness ; when we find this our own country the most wretched in the world, shall we not say, that it is *the fault* of those, who have handled our money and carried on our affairs ? And, when we find, that this money has been disposed of and that these affairs have been managed by a certain body of men, shall we not ask that those men, that that body, be *changed* ? Shall we be abused, and shall the Nabals chop us down, if we presume, that the body, be it what it may, which has brought us into this state of misery, will never get us out of it ? Shall we be hunted like wild beasts, and the Nabals pursue us with gun and spear, if we despair of seeing the same identical cause produce effects diametrically opposite in their nature ? Gentle Dames ! Amiable Abigails of England, plead for us with these “ *churlish* ” men !

We are told, that the House has had to conduct our affairs in troublesome *times*. *Times* ! What are *times* ? What does this gabble mean ? There are, as

in the past, 365 days in the year, 24 hours in the day, and 60 minutes in the hour. There are still 4 seasons. There are still a Sun to rule the day and a Moon to rule the night. What do they mean by *times*, then ? But, we have had *wars* ; long *wars*. Were they *good* ? They have been, at any rate, “ *glorious* ; ” or, else, I know who are the greatest and most brazen-faced liars that ever walked upon the earth. But, at any rate, if the wars tended to produce misery, long-lasting misery, wretchedness never known before in England ; if the wars tended to produce this calamity, for which the House has no remedy and no means of mitigation, shall the same House tell us, that it, which undertook those wars and carried them on, has a right to complain if we presume to think that the House stands in need of some *change* ? Were the wars *good* ? Strange that good wars should produce so much and such deadly mischief ! Were they *bad* ? Then they should not have been undertaken. Aye, but the final *effect* of the wars was *not foreseen*. Why was it not, then ? It should have been foreseen. The effect of every measure should be foreseen. Besides, these very per-

sons, who, in the way of apology, put forward the wars as the *cause* of our sufferings, assert that the wars were *successful* and *glorious*; so here we are, exhibiting to the world a people ruined, beggared and starved by *success* and *glory*! Verily, Dames, it is high time for a change of some sort, when these things, which invigorate and ornament all the rest of mankind, enfeeble us and cover us with filth.

Oh! it was the wars, was it! It was, indeed; though we might, if we dared, look a little further back, and we should find a *something* that was the *cause* of the wars; and, a something, too, that would not much mend the matter. However, we will stop at the French wars. And here we all go back to the mark as glibly as possible; thus: Why, do the farmers suffer? in consequence of the drawing in of the Bank-Paper. Why is that drawn in? Because Cash-payments are wanted. What are they wanted for? Because, without them, the Government cannot be safe for a day. What were they departed from for? *Because the wars could not be carried on without departing from them.* What were the wars begun and carried on *for*?—Excuse me ladies!

The wars, like Nabal's sheep-shearing, were jovial things, while they lasted. You remember the galloping and prancing, and the guzzling of wine, or stuff, of some sort, under the name of wine. You remember the roasting of sheep and oxen, the burning of men in effigy, and the hearty disposition to burn the originals. "Nabal held a feast " in his house like the feast of " a king; and Nabal's heart was " merry within him, for he was " *very drunken*." This is really a true picture of the mass of farmers in England during several years. " But, it came to pass in " the morning, when the *wine* " was *gone out of Nabal*, that " his heart died within him, and " he became as a stone." A lesson to all *drunkards*, and more especially to those who indulge in excess of *insolence* as well as in excess of drink.

But, are we *now to forgive*? Oh, yes! there are none but the ungrateful and the unjust that never forgive. The farmers will be forgiven by me, when they *repent*, and that is the condition of forgiveness; and, to *repent*, means to make *atonement*, or to do all in their power towards it. There must be *acts* of some sort, and the only kind of acts that

will satisfy me, is, an open and active part, taken by them in an endeavour to remove the *cause* of the nation's calamities; that is to say, the want of a Reform in the House of Commons. They may whine and complain as long as they please; but, until they take this part, their sufferings will give me as much pleasure as the sufferings of the friends of Reform have always appeared to give them. Until a Reform shall take place, I know they must continue to suffer; because no measures of real relief can be attempted, or, at least, adopted, without a Reform. All their petitions are in vain, unless they tend to *this point*. The whole of the pecuniary contracts of the kingdom are, in fact, broken. It is *impossible* to fulfil them as things now stand. The system has gone on, working and twisting about, till it is fairly hampered up and set fast in difficulties of its own creating. The whole thing must be unravelled; must be stretched out a-new, and again put into form and applied to purposes of good instead of evil. The language we now hear, in certain quarters, is really like that of Babel! It is all confusion: it is like noises which are just sufficient, in point of

attraction, to distract the mind, without affording it the slightest assistance. Light and darkness can co-exist as easily as wise measures can arise out of such a jumble of ideas. Opinions (as to effect as well as cause) directly opposed to each other, are put forward, at the same moment in the very same body; and some of these, delivered with the most perfect self-complacency, ought to be expected from nobody but poor creatures chained to their bed-post. Force and ignorance, when joined together, make wild work. Confusion never yet generated order: its natural tendency is to produce destruction; and we are hardly to suppose, that nature will now, all at once, suspend her laws, how easy soever other laws may have been suspended.

I beseech you, Gentle Dames, to put your husbands in motion. As they long have been most efficient for evil, endeavour to make them now efficient for good. They are *able* to do more than any other class of men, and, they ought to do more. At any rate, of this they may be assured, that, until their thistles shall bring forth figs, never will they see happy days under an unreformed House of Commons. Lord

CALTHORPE has lately observed, that the farmers, who have always, hitherto, been so docile, are beginning to grow crabbed; and, indeed, he said, that they were actually becoming "*disaffected*." If, by "*disaffected*," his Lordship means what SIDMOUTH meant, when he accused me of *disaffection*, this is really *good news*! Come to have the farmers with us, we shall get on a pace. They have hitherto been our *enemies*, instead of our partizans. Press them, Gentle Dames! Push them, while they are in the mood. Keep them up to the mark. Do not suffer them to relapse. Bring them once to *petition for Reform*, and your praises shall be sung by more and finer young men than Abigail found in the ranks of the gallant David.

In order, however, to be prepared for contingencies; in order, that you may not have *misfortunes* to talk about, you ought, even now, to begin to lay up a little *real money*. Paper is but paper, at best. If banks do not break (and they very often do), paper *burns*; and, silver and gold, though black with smoke, or even melted, are still silver and

gold. When you have laid up a bank note, you do not *know*, that it is not, or will not, at least, be *called* a forgery. And, you must know, that the Bank, to which the note belongs, *may break*. When MINCHIN of Gosport's Bank broke, the newspapers said, that the distress appeared to be as great as if some one had been stricken dead in every third house in the county! The fact is, that the notes of this Bank were *the money* of the county. The farmers' wives had *hoarded* them. They *thought* them good. They thought there was *gold* at MINCHIN's to answer them! Poor things! MINCHIN had gotten all their eggs and butter for years past! What he had done with them God knows; but that he had *had* them is very certain.

This, therefore, ought to be a *caution* to you. Indeed, it is a solemn warning. You ought to bear in mind the fact, that a Banker *never can* have in his bank as much *real money* as his notes amount to; because, if that were the case, he must *lose* by his business; and that is impossible to be believed by any persons in their senses. Nobody ever undertook a busi-

ness, by which he was *sure* to lose. You ought always to bear *this* in mind; that no banker *can* have in his chests as much money as his notes amount to.

This being the case, it follows, as matter of course, that if *all* the notes of any Banker be carried in for payment, he cannot pay them all; that is to say, he must *stop-payment*; that is to say, he must *break*. To be sure, he may have *houses* and *lands*, and these may be sold for the benefit of the poor note-holders; but, did it ever yet happen, in such a case, that there was *enough to pay them*? I believe, *never*. What reason is there, then, to suppose, that it ever *will so happen*? How dangerous is it, therefore, to *lay up* stuff like this! It is full as foolish as putting in the Lottery, where the *whole* of the gamblers taken together, are *sure to lose*; and where the chance of loss is ten to one against the chance of gain. Nay, the bank-note hoarding is *more* foolish than putting in the Lottery; for, in the case of the bank-notes, there is a chance of losing, and a certainty of not gaining.

But, you will say, "*how are*

"*we to get any money but bank-notes?*" And, to answer this question will require a little preliminary explanation. But, first of all, you can *get silver*, at any rate, at present. Put *that* by: you will shortly find it valuable; for, there are projects on foot that will shake the paper-money most furiously. When you get a shilling, put it by. There is now and then a guinea, or a sovereign, to be seen. Get it. Give a pound note and two shillings to get a guinea; or, a pound note and a shilling to get a sovereign. If you have butter to sell, sell it a little *lower* on condition of receiving payment in gold, or silver; that is to say, if you can *lay by* the price of your butter; for, as I said before, you will soon find that a *treasure* of bank-notes is very little better than a treasure of cockle-shells, or of leaves of flowers. Pretty things enough to look at; but, they will neither make the oven warm nor set the pot a boiling.

However, there are schemes afloat for making gold and silver more easy to come at. On the first of May next (if no change take place in the law) any body may go to the "*Bank of England*," as it is called, and demand gold for the paper of that Bank.

There must be 233 pounds in paper; and for this the Bank must give a piece of gold, for which, at the Mint, any body may get 233 Golden Sovereigns, worth 20 good shillings each. Now, ten of you may join, and send up paper enough to get this nice little bag of real money; and, when you have got this snug in your chests, the Banks may go off, for you, like squibs and crackers! By some means or other, real money will, in all human probability, get out in May or June. Then will be your time. Sell a little *cheaper* for real money. Make a little hoard at any rate; or, rather (for you always *have* a little hoard) make your hoard consist of *real money*; which, *let what will happen*, will always be *good*; will always buy victuals, drink and clothing.

There is a project on foot for "*lowering the standard*;" that is to say, for making the present silver shilling pass for *more* than it now passes for: and, it is proposed, by the authors of the scheme, to make it pass for about *sixteen pence*. Whether the Parliament will adopt this scheme I cannot say. But, the thing is *possible*; and, if it should be adopted, the cracking and snapping of the Banks and other

curious effects of the measure, will, I assure you, make a bit of gold, or of silver, however small, very valuable indeed. In the hour of doubt, fear, and bustle, you will in vain endeavour to get silver and gold: get it, therefore, *as soon as possible*; get it, as the Yankees emphatically say, "*right away*." Gather up even the sixpences with as much care and fondness as the hen gathers her chickens under her wings.

But, I am not sure, that the above law for paying gold at the place called the "*Bank of England*," will not be *set aside* before the first of May next! The Parliament has some sort of project for *enabling* that Bank to pay in gold and silver "*sooner* than the law, as it now stands, intended." I do not much like the talk about this! I was very well contented with the law as it stood. I was happy in the *certainty* (as I thought it) of the Bank being *compelled* to pay 233 pound notes in 233 sovereigns (or in gold enough to make them) on the first of next May. I, therefore, do not like *any* alterations in the law. In short, I think, I "*smell a rat*!" I have seen a law made to *restrain* people from getting gold at the Bank in payment of the notes which these people held;

and this law was *called* a law to *restrain the Bank from paying its notes according to law*. Therefore, when I now talk of an intended law, to enable the Bank to pay in gold *sooner* than the present law compels it so to pay, may I not reasonably fear, that the intended law will enable the people to get payment *later* than the present law would give it them? If words had always their real meaning, I should be delighted to hear of this intended law; but, after hearing a real confiscation of a part of men's estates called a "*redemption of land tax*;" after seeing men imprisoned during pleasure, and without the usual forms of law, and finally turned out of prison, without trial, without knowing their accusers, without redress, and after hearing that all this was done for the "*preservation of our liberties*;" after these things, and especially after seeing a measure, adopted *at the suggestion of the Bank of England*, to protect it against the lawful demands of its creditors, called a measure *to restrain it* from satisfying those demands; after this, and a hundred other similar instances of calling things by names signifying their contraries, I must SEE the Bank

pay "*SOONER*," before I believe the thing likely to take place.

However, the *notice* has been given! It was given on the first of March by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said, that he should, "*on a future day*," have to propose a measure "*for enabling the Bank of England and that of Ireland, to pay in CASH (sweet sound!)*" "*sooner than they were by law, at present enabled to do.*" Sweet words! But, are they merely the word of *promise*? Are they merely sound! My hopes are great, or, rather *my wishes*; for, *my fear* is too great to suffer me to say, that *I hope*. Yet, what can be plainer than the words "*To pay in cash*"? What can be *plainer*? Very true; but, what can be plainer than the words: "*Promise to pay*," on every bank-note? And yet, we know, that no *payment is meant*. We know, that, if we carry a one pound note to the Bank, all the payment we get is *just such another note*. Then I do not like the word "*enable*." Enable to pay may mean to leave it to the Bank to pay, or *not to pay*, as it shall find it convenient; and, then, judging from the past, have we

not reason to fear, that the Bank will find it most convenient *not to pay*? And, mind, if under this disguise, the *compulsion* to pay in May next should be removed, where are we then! Then we are all at sea again; we are again in the gulph of paper-money, without compass to steer by, and without sun or star to guide us!

Now, what do all these chopplings and changings, what do all these wild schemes and projects, indicate, portend, and suggest? They indicate unfixedness and want of knowledge, in the schemers; they portend inefficiency in their plans and trouble and confusion in the execution of them; and, to the people, they suggest a strong preference for *real money*, the value and utility of which, wild schemes may greatly augment, but which no schemes and no events can, by any possibility, diminish.

Therefore, once more I exhort you, get *some* real money into hoard. Cast aside, for a while, all other cares. Get some little matter of gold, or of silver, at any rate. If you had seen, as I have, people in France and America, with bags of the old paper-money of those countries, not now worth a penny a cart load, you would

begin to look about you. At any rate, a little hoard of real money can do you no harm. Above all things, do not believe, that gold can be got at the Bank of England, till you *see* the thing with your *own eyes*. You remember, that the Bank *has been to pay* in gold fifteen different times; and you *know*, that it has not *paid* once. You remember that at twelve different times the *inimitable notes* were to make their appearance; and you *know*, that not one such note has yet appeared. Never, therefore, suffer your belief, relative to *any* thing about the Bank, to go a hair's breadth beyond the actual *sight of your own eyes*.

If, after all, the present law should take its course, until the month of May, and the Bank of England should really give 233 pounds worth of *real gold* for 233 pounds in its notes, you may not have the notes of this great Bank by you. But, you can get them with your *country notes*, mind that; for, the Country Bank Paper people are *compelled* by law, to give Bank of England notes in exchange for theirs, if you demand it; or, they are compelled to give you *good gold*. Therefore, it will be very easy to get your country notes turned into

gold, if the law be not changed before the first of May. Any one, who *keeps* a country note after that day, must be little better than *silly*. To pass away immediately, it may do; but, to *keep* such note for more than a few days would be to discover insanity. However, my advice is, *keep none*; keep no note of any kind; and then neither the *forg*er nor the *broken banker* can ruin you. A bag of gold, or of silver, however small, is *something*; is always something; always must be something; but, a bale of bank-notes *may* become not worth a straw. Keep a *little* real money, at any rate: if you do not, and if, for the want of it, you shall see a day of most horrible affliction, remember, in that day, the advice of

Your friend,

WM COBBETT.

P. S. The above Letter was begun in London, and finished in the country. I have just now

(7th March) heard a whisper about *Tokens*! About "paying in cash" by *Tokens*! If this should really be the case, *hoot-a-wa*! as the people of Sweet Edinborough say, when they are about to send down from their windows the result of the day before's repasts. *Hoot-a-wa*, if the *Tokens* be really coming! Get rid of every rag of *country-money* first; and then get rid of the Threadneedle-Street paper-money as fast as you can. Get the *Tokens*, if you cannot get *coin*. Even if they be half brass, or all brass, get them. They may serve to mend holes in kettles or pots or warming pans; and the *paper* would be of *no use* whatever; seeing that the *Tract Society* alone sends forth, gratis, more paper than is sufficient for lighting all the pipes of the smoking part of his Majesty's subjects, and for all other purposes not connected with intellectual necessities. The *Religious Tract Society* having most kindly undertaken to furnish paper, for

nothing, for these purposes, there can, when even brass Tokens can be had, be no earthly use for bank-notes. Therefore, if Tokens come out, get the Tokens!—However, this Token-Story cannot, surely, be true! Any thing so barefaced as this; any thing so completely a fulfilment of my prophesies; any thing, so shameful to all the parties concerned, will hardly be adopted, as *yet*, at any rate.—Any thing of a Token project, no matter what, will, mind, include a *repeal of Peel's Bill*. In short, there can be nothing done in the way proposed, which will not, in effect, repeal that Bill. We may, I and my Disciples, hold ourselves ready, therefore, for the *feast of the Gridiron*. Oh! my God! how we will crow! We will no longer complain of the *banishment-bill*! We shall have received ample *amends*, not only for all our sufferings, but for our *intended* sufferings! It shall be my business to *record* the transactions, and to send the record into

every hovel in every part of England, Scotland, Ireland and America. As far as the sound of the English Language reaches, shall those become famous who passed *Peel's Bill and the Banishment Bill*.

IMITATION OF COFFEE.

A trial has taken place in the Exchequer on an information against the Defendant for preparing and selling an *imitation of coffee*. A verdict has been given for the Crown, and the penalties amount to 200*l*. The facts, as they came out on the trial, are these: that the Defendant had made a preparation of *Rye*, which he had roasted and ground, and sold under the name of "*Break-fast Powder*." This, it was alleged, was in violation of the *Act of Parliament*, made for preventing the fabrication of stuff to *adulterate coffee*. I have not the Act before me; but, I remember, that it is extremely carefully

drawn; and that it is extremely difficult to avoid its penalties by any means other than those of open avowal of the nature of the thing fabricated.

The Act was made for the purpose of preventing dealers in coffee from *adulterating* it by putting amongst it roasted and ground beans, acorns, and other things, which has been frequently done, and the consequences of which coffee-drinkers frequently experience in those gripings and other pains, which powerful *astringents* generally produce. But, it never could be intended to prevent people from *using* wheat, rye, or any thing else; or, if openly avowed, from *selling* such things to their neighbours.

The error of the Defendant, in all these cases, appears to have been, that they called their article by a name, which made it doubtful, at least, whether their traffick came within the descriptions given in the Act of Parliament. "*Breakfast Powder*" is an equivocal appellation; and the

Act is so scrupulously comprehensive as to suffer nothing equivocal to escape it. But, if a man were to advertise and sell, "*Roasted Wheat, Roasted Rye,*" or, "*Roasted Wheat - flower, Roasted Rye-flower,*" no Jury that could be impannelled would declare him guilty of a violation of the Act. He need not say, whether it is for *breakfast, dinner* or *supper*. Just give it its real name, and leave the Excise to find out and make out the crime of selling it.

Best Wheat, at present prices, costs rather less than *three half-pence a pound*, brought home to your door by the quarter. *Rye* does not cost *a penny*. The average of them may be a penny farthing. Roasting and grinding and putting up in papers may cost *a penny*. Add a penny farthing for *profit and Waste*. Sell the flour for *three pence half-penny a pound*. Do this, and the Excise will never succeed in a prosecution. But, you must call the thing by its *real name*; or,

it will expose you to the tormentors of the law.

White-flour (Wheaten) is now sold in London, retail, at about 2d. a pound; but, observe, the *bran* and *pollard* are taken out. Allow ten pounds to the bushel for *loss of weight* in roasting and grinding. Then you have 50lbs. of brown flour. This costs you, taking the average of Wheat and Rye, about 5s. 4d. The work on it, as above, 4s. 2d. Together 9s. 6d. And you sell it for 14s. 7d. Leaving a profit, on each bushel, of 5s. 1d. This very far surpasses the profits of the *Baker*; and, while the trade would be as lawful as that of the Baker, it would be carried on with infinitely less risk of bad debts and less capital, in proportion to the profit.

That the flour of wheat or rye roasted is *better* than coffee, or tea, I know well, from more than a year's experience; and that it is not a tenth part so expensive I also well know. Neither coffee nor tea is nutritious; they both

affect the nerves so as to produce a disinclination to sleep. While the brown flour, equally pleasant to the taste, is nutritious and wholesome in all respects.

It is very strange that the Land-owners, while they are seeking for *Corn-Bills*, never think of this matter. Half a pound of wheat a day to each family would cause a consumption, in this kingdom, of about 9,000,000 of bushels a year. It would require nearly *half a million* of acres of land to grow it on. It would give employment to about 50,000 labouring men and their families, consisting of 250,000 persons. Its amount, in threshed wheat, would be about *three millions of pounds sterling a year*. But, those wise Land-owners seem to prefer the prosperity of the Planters in the Islands, to protect whom and whose negroes, they are very willing to maintain fleets and armies. This is, indeed, their own affair; but, then, we, surely, ought to be permitted to *laugh* at them, without

the risk of being *banished* for the indulgence of our merriment.

As to the *using* of roasted wheat, or rye, or any other grain, there is, at any rate, *no law* to prevent our doing that; and, in every family, the thing may easily be prepared. I do, however, believe, that, if the "*evil*" were to go, even in this way, to any great length, the wise Land-owners, in their extreme anxiety to hand over their estates (or, rather, the remainder of them) to the fund-holders, would be clamorous for a law to send inspectors to our fire-sides to see that we did not commit the crime of roasting wheat and rye! Their proceedings have long been, with me, much more a subject of *curiosity* and of *fun* than of interest and of serious observation. The antics of the monkey, who cut his own throat with a razor, instead of the throat of the monkey in the glass, were not a more legitimate subject of laughter than are the antics of the Land-owners at this moment. Every thing

they say and do tends to their own final overthrow, while they think they are annoying others. Who but them would not see, that this hostility towards the Radical Coffee People is so injurious to nobody as to *themselves*? They complain, that the *Poor* are *eating them up*; and they do nothing to enable the poor to become less burthensome. They will insist upon it that a part, and a large part too, of what they pay in poor-rates, shall be given to the West India Planter to feed his negroes with, and to enable him to purchase up what the fundholders do not demand of their estates. Well: it really is their own affair; and, I do not see why others should interfere. Their destiny is prepared; and let them fulfil it.

COBBETT'S STAMPED REGISTER.

THIS work will be published with a *Stamp*, on Saturday, the 31st of *March*, and every week afterwards. It will continue to be published *without*

the stamp also. The stamp is absolutely necessary to make the work reach, with any thing like regularity, gentlemen in *Ireland* and in the *Country-Places* in England. The price of the stamped Register will be *a shilling*, the stamp itself being *four-pence*. The paper will be *one sheet* of the very largest size that the *law* allows of. It will be very good, and folded in such a way as to contain *thirty-two pages* with double columns. The mode of obtaining this work is that of application to *News-men*; but, if any gentleman, wishing to have the work, should find any difficulty in doing this, he will please to apply to the Publisher (*postage paid*), who will punctually attend to the application.

It is intended to take *Advertisements* to fill the *last leaf* of the Register, stamped as well as *unstamped*, in order to assist in defraying the expence of superior paper and print. The very sight of a pamphlet like the Register, compared with other pamphlets, must convince every one that its great numbers only could enable the proprietor to sell it at so low a price. The *Slut-Acts Parliament* has compelled him to have such a quantity of paper, and he *will not* have bad paper and print. A leaf of *Advertisements* may help to make up for the great ex-

penses arising from this cause.—The particulars as to advertising will be stated at the Office. It is presumed, that there would be great advantage in advertising in the Register, which is, generally, read by persons of an attentive turn of mind. The work is read by great numbers of persons, in country as well as in town. It is not thrown aside as soon as read. Its form is calculated for preservation; and its contents cause it, most frequently, to be looked over again and again.—However, those who have to advertise are the best judges of this, and their judgment will be their guide.

A new Edition of PAPER AGAINST GOLD is now published, price 5s. bound in boards.

COBBETT'S RELIGIOUS TRACTS, No. I., (to be continued monthly) is just published, and has already gone through two editions, to the great terror of the "*Tract Society*," who dread the approach of Common Sense as Owls do the rising of the Sun.

The American INDIAN CORN, WATER-MELON, CITRON-MELON, and PUMPKIN, seed, are sold at the Office. Particulars relating to all these will be found in Register, No. 7, published on the 17th February.

“CATHOLIC EMANCIPA-
“TION.”

I use these two words, because they point out the matter known by the name; but, certainly, the measure, if carried, would do the *body* of Catholics no good whatever, unless a *Reform* of the Parliament were *also* to take place. This matter has amused the country for so many years, that it is really, as it stands now, hardly worthy of serious attention. Yet, that *unsearchable being*, Mr. JAMES PERRY affects to discover a most auspicious prospect in the bare circumstance of the subject having been sent to a Committee in the House of Commons! He has these profound and heart-gladdening remarks on this circumstance: “We sincerely con-
“gratulate the country on the
“result of the motion for the ap-
“pointment of a Committee to
“consider of the Laws that affect
“the Roman Catholics, for at no
“previous time did the temper

“of Parliament shew itself so li-
“berally disposed to do justice
“to this *most valuable* and op-
“pressed *body* of our fellow sub-
“jects. The enlightened opi-
“nion of the country is felt with-
“in the walls of the House of
“Commons, and there are cir-
“cumstances most auspicious to
“the great question, elsewhere,
“to which we need not allude.
“His MAJESTY will go to Ire-
“land *with a splendour truly*
“*worthy of the Monarch of a*
“*brave and gallant people*, if he
“goes after having given the
“Royal Assent to a Bill which
“will remove the disabilities
“and *heal the divisions* that
“have so long agitated that
“part of the United Kingdom:
“He will *return to his Corc-*
“*nation with éclat*, and take
“the oath of fidelity to the
“Constitution *as then* by law
“established with the *delight*
“that *must be innate in a ge-*
“nerous heart.”

God bless us! How this gen-
tleman is come about, within

these few weeks ! Does he smell *Baronet* ? Does he remember *Sir Bate Dudley* ? It is not a month since this same person declared, that the House of Commons had *no feeling in common with the people* ; and that, therefore, *Reform* was become necessary ! Now he tells us, that the "*enlightened opinion of the country is felt within the walls of the House of Commons* !" Well for him he is not *Cobbett*, or how he would be massacred by Mr. Brougham for *inconsistency* ! How that noisy educator would chop him about ! What a deal of dull sarcasm he would pour forth upon him !

I have no objection to any compliments bestowed on the Catholics, but I hate all exaltation of classes and parts of the kingdom. The mass of the Irish want *food and raiment* much more than any thing else. They are naturally full of *spirit* and *genius*, and of *industry* too. They have a little too much of levity and fickleness ; but

these are amply made up for by their warmth and hospitality. Make them easy in their circumstances, and all their peculiar foibles disappear. See them *in America*. See them doing almost all the hard labour, and possessing no small part of the property, of the bright and busy city of New York. See them on that happy scene, and you will then really know what they are. *There* there is a Catholic Congregation, with *fifteen thousand communicants*, as good and orderly people as ever lived in the world. This shows what the Irish *really are* ; and it points out what they want at home : namely, good food and raiment in exchange for their labour and the use of their talents ; and not an unmeaning and wholly ineffectual thing, called "*emancipation*." It is not a measure like this, nor a snivelling thing about *schooling*, that will do any real good to this misruled part of the kingdom, which,

while it is one of the finest countries in the world, contains, perhaps, the most wretched people. *Schooling* is not *education*: education is *bringing up*; and how is this to be accomplished by such petty and partial means? To put Ireland to rights requires a great deal to be done; but nothing in the *small* way. Why cannot the Irish in Ireland be made like the Irish at New York? Ah! Why cannot the English be made a hundreth part so well off as those American Irish? Talk of obstacles: where are they? We know where, but we dare not say, lest we be *banished*.

The measure will, I dare say, go off in *talk*. It seems to be a standing *dish*; for, I have seen it on the table for *twenty years*! Of much more importance, therefore, at present, is the surprisingly altered tone of that "*unsailable* being," Mr. JAMES PERRY. This person is become furiously "*loyal*," all at once.

The fit appears to have taken him upon the *King's going to the theatre the first time*. People were astonished at the account. All the world knew *how* the thing had been *got up*; but, Mr. PERRY could not see *behind the curtain*. He could not get a peep. All was *real*; all was *bona fide*, with him. The *clapping* "came from the heart: it was the *spontaneous effusion of sincere love*." Oh! sincere gentleman! The object of all this will come out by-and-by. *Inscrutable* as the "*being*" is, we shall search his motives out. At present we will leave him.

GRAMPOUND!

~~~~~

What! Do I mean to take *serious* notice of this! Not *serious* notice. That is impossible; but I mean to notice it; for out of it some very pretty little *jocose* matter has arisen. Such a thing was, to be sure, never before heard of in the world. Were I a painter, I would, upon this

occasion, fling away the pen, and take to the pencil; for no words can do justice to the scene.

There would I place the *old Oak*, corroded at the root, his top dead, his trunk hollow, loosened at his base, rocking with every blast: and there would I place Lord John Russell, in the person of a *Tom-Tit*, endeavouring to put all to rights by picking at a nest of animalcula seated in the half-rotted bark of one of the meanest of the branches! What, then, do I despise that gift of the Creator; that gift called a *Tom-Tit*! By no means. I sincerely thank God for *Tom-Tits*, and for *Sparrows* also. \* The latter prevent our gardens from being totally destroyed by wire-worms, caterpillars, and other enemies of vegetation; and, as to Mr. Thomas Tit, he is the best guardian of the health of our trees. He is seen running along on the underside of the bows, looking for the eggs of those insects which injure the bark, and, sometimes, enter the trunks of the trees. Some think,

that he is eating the *buds*; but he is really clearing the tree of injurious insects. Far, therefore, be it from me to speak in disparagement of the *Tom-Tit*. But, I cannot extol his minute efforts, when bestowed upon a tree that is sound in neither root nor trunk, that has not a branch that is free from canker, that is spewing up funguses from his stem, and that, is, from bottom to top, locked close up in the mortal embraces of the moss.

I shall now insert the Report of what passed in a *Committee* on *Lord John Russell's Bill*. It is *curious*, though *interesting* in no other way. Mr. BARING made some remarks, which, as the reader will see, contain both *truth* and *wit*. They were also *pertinent*; and, when I have inserted the debate, I will endeavour to make them *useful*.

Upon the proposition of Lord J. RUSSELL, the report of the Grampound Election Bill was recommitted.

Mr. S. WORTLEY objected to the amount of the qualification for voting, which the Noble Lord proposed for

Leeds, that qualification being only for such persons as rented houses at 10l. a year. This qualification he thought too low, and that it ought to be raised much higher; for he was ready to avow his opinion, that where the population was very numerous, the right of voting should be comparatively narrowed. He was by no means an advocate for placing Leeds, or any other great town, upon the same footing as Westminster with respect to the right of voting. Upon the best inquiries which he had been able to make, he found that the rate of 20l. would include every person of the rank of a respectable tradesman in the Borough, and give a body of voters to the amount of between 2 and 3,000. He should wish, therefore, that instead of the words 10 pounds, the words 20 pounds be inserted. He would rather propose this amendment at a future stage of the proceedings than now, in order to give the House a full opportunity of considering the subject.

Lord MILTON begged leave to express his entire approbation of the mode of Reform which had been introduced by his Noble Friend. It proceeded strictly upon constitutional principles, and for this reason he preferred it, both to the proposition for extending the elective franchise to the West Riding of Yorkshire, and to

that for transferring it to the Hundreds in the neighbourhood of Grampound. There was one point, however, on which he was inclined to differ, both from his Honourable Friend, and his Noble Friend who framed the Bill. Instead of making any fanciful experiments, or attempting to set our own wisdom above the wisdom of our ancestors, instead of hazarding any innovation upon the ancient and recognised Constitution, he thought it would be a much safer and wiser course to make the borough of Leeds a mere scot and lot borough, like all others where the inhabitant householders had the right of voting.—It must be recollected that there were other persons in this country who were entitled to protection, as well as those who possessed large property. The lower orders stood just as much in need of protection as persons in more exalted stations. If we examined the state of the country for the last 25 years, no man, he apprehended, would deny, that the lower orders of the people had suffered more from the pressure of the times than persons in the higher classes of life. The House was bound, therefore, to consider the interests of that portion of the community; and as this was probably the first of a series of measures, which would be applied to the reform of the Representation of

the people, they ought not to lay down a principle of election which might exclude from the elective franchise persons in the humbler walks of life [hear, hear, hear]. The corruption which prevailed in the smaller Boroughs, was rarely to be found in those where the electors were very numerous. It was perhaps of little importance, whether in the present instance the number of electors should be three or six thousand, with reference to the interests of the particular borough, but it was a point of material importance, when considered with reference to the way in which the inferior classes of the people would receive *the boon* which the House was now *offering to them*. As to the distinction of *respectable* classes, as distinguished from the inferior orders, he protested against the use of the term. One class of society might be poorer or more unfortunate than another, but the poorest man in the realm, if he were honest, sober, and industrious, was just *as respectable* as the most exalted [hear]. For these reasons he thought that, instead of wishing to raise the qualification, the House would do better to abandon all qualification, and proceed, in legislating for this particular case, with a view of conciliating the people, and acting upon the ancient and recognised principles of the Constitution.

Sir R. WILSON begged to observe, in answer to what had fallen from the Honourable Gentleman opposite, that the conduct of *the Electors of Westminster*, so far from having been dishonoured by any corruption, had been distinguished by the greatest purity. Their example, therefore, so far from being an argument against the exercise of the elective franchise by scot and lot, was directly in its favour. With respect to the Borough of Southwark, he could state that his (Sir R. Wilson's) first election did not cost above 700*l.*, though he had to contend against great wealth, long possession, and high respectability. The expenses of his last election, including charges for printing, did not exceed 300*l.* He entirely agreed with the Noble Lord (Milton), that the House ought to extend the elective franchise as much as possible to the poorer classes of society, for the poorer classes were subjected to the burthen of taxation, and it was an acknowledged principle of the Constitution, that representation should be co-extensive with taxation.

Lord J. RUSSELL said, that this subject had been so long before the House, that they ought to be in possession of all the information connected with it. He trusted, therefore, that if the Honourable Gentleman op-



posite intended to make any opposition, he would make it now, and not defer it to a distant period.

Mr. S. WORTLEY said, he did not mean to cast any reflection upon the Electors of Westminster. He agreed that there was a radical difference of opinion between himself and the hon. and gallant officer (Sir R. Wilson), for the principle upon which he should legislate would be a principle of property, whereas he (Sir Robert) was inclined to give the right of voting to numbers, and not to property. He had no objection to propose the amendment at once, and he would move, therefore, that the word "ten" be omitted, and "twenty" substituted for it.

Sir R. WILSON said, that when the honourable Gentleman opposite wished to give the elective franchise to property, he seemed totally to forget that labour was property, and that, in point of fact, the poorest labourer in the country paid 10*l.* out of 18*l.* in taxes, and in the course of the year 100 day's labour out of the 300.

Mr. T. COURTENAY said, with reference to what had fallen from the Noble Lord opposite (Lord Milton), that there never was an instance of a scot and lot borough having been created by Act of Parliament. As to the purity of the Electors of West-

minster, upon which the Honourable Member for Southwark insisted, he (Mr. C.) could only say, that the inhabitants of the City of Westminster had been grossly calumniated, if a great deal of corruption had not existed in former elections. He should certainly support the amendment of his Hon. Friend.

Mr. GURNEY said a few words, which were not distinctly audible.

Mr. BARING said, that the particular mode of adding two Members to that House was not in itself a question of great importance. At the same time, as this was the first instance in which Parliament was called upon to apply a general principle of legislation, in that view it was material that the House should weigh maturely what it promulgated upon this subject. In framing a system of representation, experience proved the necessity of looking to property as an essential principle for the permanence of social order. At the same time, it was undoubtedly essential that the interests of the poorer or less fortunate classes of society should be mixed up with those considerations. It would be unwise to take property as the simple basis of representation, as the French had done. It was true, that the basis of property was sufficient, as a security; but then the consequence would be, as in France, a total indif-



ference on the part of the people as to the election of their Representatives, or their conduct after they were elected. The *representation in America*, on the other hand, furnished an example of the defects of the popular principle, when taken as the principal basis. He thought, therefore, that the plan of representation best adapted to this and every other country would be one graduated a little upon the scale of principle, and regulated by the principle of the Vestry Bill that passed some years ago. If, for instance, 10l. were taken as a basis conferring a right of one vote, the scale might be graduated, so as to give to the higher classes of society *three or four votes* [a laugh]. Such a system as this would, in his opinion, supply the two desiderata of security, both with respect to property and the *good will of the people*. With respect to what had fallen from his Honourable and Gallant Friend, he admitted, that the conduct of the Electors of Westminster and Southwark had, in the latter instances, been most unexceptionable. But though no great expenditure of money was incurred by the Candidates, he must say that there was a most extravagant expenditure of what perhaps was a more serious tax upon the Candidates, he meant *nonsense* [a loud laugh]. No person stood a chance of

success as a popular candidate for those places, unless he condescended to use such language as he would be ashamed to use, in talking of the same subjects, not only in the society of gentlemen, but among Englishmen possessing *common sense* [hear, hear, and much laughter].

Sir, R. WILSON rose to call his Honourable Friend to order. He apprehended that no Honourable Member had a right to say that another Honourable Member had not only talked nonsense, but used such language as he would be ashamed to use in another place. He did not know whether his Honourable Friend had ever been present when he (Sir R. Wilson) addressed the *Inhabitants of Southwark* [a laugh]. He wished his Honourable Friend would attend *some of their meetings*, that he might correct the opinion which he appeared to entertain of them.

The CHAIRMAN rose to order. He had not understood the words of the Honourable Member for Taunton to apply either to the Honourable and Gallant Officer or his Colleague.

Mr. BARING said, he should be extremely sorry if any thing which had fallen from him should be ascribed to a want of respect for his Honourable and Gallant Friend, and to the Honourable Baronet who was not now in

*his place* (Sir Francis Burdett). There was no man for whose talents he had a greater admiration, or whom he should be *so sorry to lose, as a Member of the House*, than that Honourable Baronet. At the same time he must maintain, that any man who would complain of great public grievances, and enlarge upon the sufferings of the people—any man who would talk the *greatest nonsense* upon legislation and good government [hear, hear! from Lord Castlereagh], was most likely to succeed at such elections *as those for Westminster and Southwark*. Under all the circumstances, he felt inclined to support the amendment of the Honourable Gentleman opposite (Mr. S. Wortley).

Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COURTENAY explained.

Lord MILTON felt it his duty to move, as an amendment, that all the words implying any restriction upon the right of voting should be omitted.

Mr. S. WORTLEY consented to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. C. WYNN suggested that the regular course would be to take the sense of the House upon the question, that the original words of the clause down to a certain part of it; because, if the Honourable Gentleman opposite withdrew his amendment, the Noble Lord's motion would be an

amendment upon a question which had no existence.

Lord MILTON agreed with the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, and accordingly moved that all the words of the clause down to the word "some," stand part of the Bill.

Lord ALTHORP observed, that he was decidedly friendly to that alteration in the representation, which gave the people a greater share in the deliberative proceedings of that House. He should support the Amendment of the Noble Lord (Milton).

Mr. MARTIN (Galway) thought if the Noble Lord (we presume Lord John Russel) had it in contemplation to submit a motion of general reform, the present Bill had been better withdrawn until that question was disposed of. If, however, the Noble Lord wanted to have some one borough brought before that House for dissection, would it not have been more natural in him to have selected one with which he was more particularly acquainted? He wished to address himself more particularly to those Gentlemen who were determined to disfranchise the Borough of Grampond, because they there had palpable and visible evidence of corruption. It reminded him of a transaction in which a friend of his was engaged. He was

about to be married to a lady having a fortune of 200,000*l.*, and wished to consult his solicitor, who resided in the neighbourhood of Lincoln's-inn-fields. Another officer of the law lived in the same vicinity, he believed of the name of Radford, whom he did not wish to see, as it was the long vacation, and he had reason to believe a writ was in that quarter also (a laugh). A friend called on the officer to obtain the indulgence, backed by an offer of 30*l.*—"What," said the officer, "do you think that with a writ in my possession, I should see Mr. Such-a-one and not arrest him? I know my duty better." "Well," said the Gentleman, "give back the 30*l.*" "Oh, no; I'll arrest him if I see him; but don't you also know I can shut my eyes (a laugh)?" It was so with the Gentlemen opposite. Their eyes were open to Gram-pound, but were shut to other boroughs where corruption has generally prevailed. With the little accordance that existed between the Members of Westminster, Southwark and Middlesex, and the majority of that House, he thought it could be no recommendation to that majority to sanction a mode of return at Leeds which was calculated to pro-

cure the return of Gentlemen possessing similar opinions.

Mr LOCKHART considered that any change in the representation should be bottomed in property. He should support a proposition for some qualification in the vote beyond scot and lot.

Sir R. WILSON, in explanation, observed that the right of election in the Borough of Southwark, was in the inhabitant householders paying scot and lot. He disregarded the criticism of those, "whose praise was censure, and whose censure, praise."

Mr. MARTIN explained. He did not criticise the character of the Hon. General—he had no wish to offend his feelings. If he had such an intention, he would not have selected that place for such a purpose.

Mr. HURST expressed his hope, that when the House was creating a new right, they should not overlook the claims of the poorer classes, who so largely contributed to the burdens of the state, and bore with such patience their unexampled privations. The introduction of any sum as a qualification in a scot and lot borough, was an innovation [hear!]. In all former cases where boroughs were disfranchised for corruption, in transferring the right of voting, an extension of the franchise took place.

Mr. PERL admitted that whether the sum was ten or twenty pounds, the adoption of the qualification was an arbitrary principle. As they were transferring the right of return to Leeds, he thought they should give the inhabitants a substance, not a shadow. He understood that the payment of the poor's rate on ten pounds a year, would give a respectable constituency of nearly three thousand voters. Had the transference been to the East Riding of Yorkshire, they should not have been at sea, as they then were, *in search of a principle*. The scot and lot right was certainly more congenial with the Constitution, but there were circumstances in the locality of Leeds which made it disadvantageous to give an unlimited right of voting. It was a great manufacturing town, and such an abstraction of the people from their habits of industry would work a great disservice.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE stated, that he had formerly been of opinion the better mode of disposing of the elective franchise of Grampound, would be to add it to County Representation, by giving it to the West Riding of York, but he had altered that opinion, and now supported the transfer to the town of Leeds, according to Lord John Russell's motion, which he conceived was adhering *strictly to the principal*

*of the Constitution*, though making some innovation with respect to the details.

Mr. S. WORTLEY explained.

Mr. MONCK advocated the amendment of the Noble Lord Milton, for extending the new right of franchise in Leeds to all inhabitants paying scot and lot, on the ground that the extent of the population would tend to preserve the purity of election. He was the more anxious that this establishment of a *bona fide* representation, should be the object of the House, because he was convinced that the exclusion of the poor from the privilege of electing Representatives, in many parts of the kingdom, was attended with bad and dangerous consequences; one of its unhappy effects was to lay unequal pressure of taxation on the industrious classes, compared with the rich proprietors, for the land tax had remained the same for a whole century, while the price of Beer was quadrupled. He would, therefore, vote for the Noble Lord's amendment.

LORD CASTLEREAGH made some objection to the principle of the Bill, which he would have preferred had it gone to extend the franchise to County representation, instead of to a manufacturing borough. He thought the representation of manufacturing towns, at which ought least to be aug-



mented, because it disturbed the industrious habits of artizans and gave rise to danger and alarm. He was decidedly opposed, at all events, to the qualification by scot and lot; and since the House had decided on transferring the franchise to Leeds, he thought that the right of voting should be confined to inhabitants who rented houses of 20l. This he begged to be understood he did, although he would have much *preferred the principle* of a district reform.

After some further discussion between Mr. R. Martin, Mr. Denman, Mr. W. Courtenay and Mr. Scarlett, Lord John Russell replied, and the House divided upon Lord Milton's Amendment, when there appeared—

|                   |   |   |   |      |
|-------------------|---|---|---|------|
| For the Amendment | - | - | - | 66   |
| Against it        | - | - | - | 182  |
| Majority          | - | - | - | —116 |

Mr. STUART WORTLEY then submitted his proposed Amendment for limiting the right of voting to persons who rented houses at the yearly rent of 20l. On a division there appeared—

|                   |   |   |   |     |
|-------------------|---|---|---|-----|
| For the Amendment | - | - | - | 148 |
| Against it        | - | - | - | 94  |
| Majority          | - | - | - | —54 |

The motion of Lord John Russell was of course negatived.

As to the *subject* of this *talk* it is unworthy of the notice of

my readers or of me. It is worth preserving merely out of curiosity, and as an instance of the gravity, with which law-givers can talk on such a matter. The talk has no effect upon any body. Whether Grampound or Leeds, send two of the sons or cousins or uncles or brothers of the Peers, or of the Bank or Change Alley, is of no kind of consequence to the people of this kingdom. But, what Mr. BARRING said about the elections in *Westminster* and *Southwark* is well worthy of attention: it was *witty*, it was *apt*, and it was *substantially true*; and, as an argument in favour of *scot and lot* election, what could be so completely unhappy as the *example* of *Westminster* and *Southwark*! And, how could *Sir Robert Wilson* venture upon such an argument! While *scot and lot election* was a subject of *praise*, and especially while Lord Milton had it in his hand, Sir Robert should have not only held his tongue, but should, if possible,



have crept out of sight, that no speaker's eye might have put it into his head to refer to the example of Southwark and Westminster, where the *right*, all *right*, of election is rendered a farce as complete as that of a county-meeting; and where a mere *knot of intriguers* actually usurp the powers of the electors. In these cases it is PROVED that *scot and lot* is no better than *burgage tenures*. Sir Robert should, therefore, have been *silent*.

However, this is really a *large subject*. I shall treat of it in my next Register, fully; for, to talk of *reforming* the Parliament by making *all places as rotten as Westminster is now become*; to talk of a *reform* that is to render *intrigue, imposture and duplicity* universal, is a little *too bad*: to talk of a reform, that is to cause it to be believed, that the *people* actually *prefer* having *Army-Officers* and *pension pap fed Members*, is what I cannot suffer to pass unexposed; and expose the thing I will. Mr. BARING was quite right, as far as he went; but he did not go far enough. He was not *in the secret*. I will let him into it. The next Register shall expose the means by which Westminster Elections are carried on.

#### POSTSCRIPT 2nd.

I have this moment (Thursday Noon) perceived, that Mr. CURWEN has made a *direct push* at that "*monster of consumption*," "the fundholder;" and that he has been fiercely repelled by Mr. VAN. Nobody appears to have said a word on Mr. CURWEN's side. The Commissioner of Scotch Herrings seems to have pickled the Country Gentleman pretty well! The Land Boys were *afraid*! The "*monster of consumption*" was too terrific, when they came to *face* him. However, we have, at last, got a *direct* proposition to *reduce* the Debt; a proposition for the making of which PERRY marked me out for punishment in 1805 and 1806; while OLD SHERRY wanted me to be *prosecuted by the House itself*!—Oh! What an *answer* would I have given to VAN! How closely would I have shut up his lips!—But, no matter: Let the thing *work*: let the bumble bees moil about in the tar-barrel: get out they cannot.—I will, in my NEXT, answer VAN; for I am not *afraid* of the "*Monster of consumption*."—On Saturday, the 24th instant, I shall publish my essays on the *legality*, the *justice* and *necessity* of *reducing the in-*

*terest of the Debt.* These essays were published between 1803, and 1810. They were the fore-runner of *Paper against Gold*; and, when now collected, they will be called PART I. of *Paper against Gold*. The Price of Part I. will be 5s.—When a man has read this, he will laugh at the nonsense about what is called “*National Faith*.” He will see that the breach of faith has been on the *other side*.—The next Saturday after, I shall publish a THIRD PART, consisting of the Long-Island Essays on the subject of the Paper-Money and Cash-Payments, including Peel’s Bill. This will complete the *work*. After these, there will be nothing to do, but to *wait events*. To stand and look at the bumble bees, while they twist themselves up and another themselves! We shall have brave sport! Our turn to laugh is now come! When the empty skulls were abusing me 1803, I consoled myself by looking forward to this day

of triumph.—During the trial of an action of *Wright* against *Mr. Clement* last year, it came out, that Mr. Clement had had the stock of “*Paper against Gold*” in his hands. Something fell from the Witness about stock *sold for waste paper*. “*Ach!*” giggled out GURNEY, the lawyer, who was sitting with a brief before him, and who caught up his pen and began to write; “*Ach, Ach, ah! Paper against Gold sold for waste paper!*” He repeated the giggle four or five times, and looked so archly and so sweetly at the Bench, at the same time.—Now, Mr. Gurney, have you written any book? If you have, or, if you should write one, I will venture to say, that “*Paper against gold*” is now called for more times in one day, than any book of yours ever was, or ever will be, from the hour of its appearance in print, till that of its consignment to the Trunkmaker.